



Regional Research Institute Publications and
Working Papers

Regional Research Institute

1997

Regional Aspects of Political Party Development in the United States: The Case of Governors, 1789-1824

Anna Falkner

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/rri_pubs



Part of the [Regional Economics Commons](#)

Digital Commons Citation

Falkner, Anna, "Regional Aspects of Political Party Development in the United States: The Case of Governors, 1789-1824" (1997).
Regional Research Institute Publications and Working Papers. 183.
https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/rri_pubs/183

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Regional Research Institute at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Regional Research Institute Publications and Working Papers by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu.

Regional Aspects of Political Party Development
in the United States:
The Case of Governors, 1789-1824

by

Anna Falkner

RESEARCH PAPER 9711

National Science Foundation Undergraduate Research Fellow
afalkner@wvu.edu

Mentor: Professor Kenneth C. Martis
Regional Research Institute
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6825
Morgantown, WV 26506-6825

April 1997

Abstract: The current political system is a compilation of the events of political party formation and transformation that have occurred over the last two hundred years. The following research focuses on the development of the first political system in the United States. The rivalry between the Federalists and Republicans led to the modern party system. The system developed in the 1790s, matured by 1800, and then declined by 1810s. This research focuses on governor political affiliations and makes observations about regional patterns. The research objectives are: identification of party affiliation, identification of method of election, and regional analysis of party strength for governors. The United States is divided into four regions: New England, Middle Atlantic, South, and West. The regional analysis led to discoveries about why the Republican party began to dominate the country. The Republican party did not have much support in the mid 1790s, but their support slowly grew. The Federalists lost control in most areas, except for the New England region. By 1824, the last year of the study, only one governor was a Federalist. This research explains the Federalist decline and the eventual decline of the Republicans. This is the first era of United States political parties and is often termed "the experimental system."

Regional Aspects of Political Party Development in the United States:

The Case of Governors 1789-1824

One definition of political parties is "the formal banning together or organization of individuals who have some measure of ideological agreement in order to nominate and run candidates in somewhat free and democratic elections" (Plano 1982: 165). The current political system is a compilation of the events of political party formation that have occurred over the last two hundred years. The following research focuses on the development of the first political system in the United States. The rivalry between the Federalists and Republicans helped produce the party system. The system developed in the 1790s, matured by 1800, and then declined by 1819 (Chambers: The First Party System 3). This research is the first comprehensive listing and mapping of the political affiliation of the governors from 1789 to 1824. The research then analyzes and compares regional patterns among governors.

Goals and Objectives

The research has three main objectives with respect to state governors: identification of party affiliation, identification of method of election, and regional analysis of party patterns. The United States is tentatively divided into four regions: New England, Middle Atlantic, South, and West. See Table 1 for a listing of the states in each region.

The first objective identified the selection method of governors and when popular election occurred in each state. Eight of the thirteen original states did not have direct popular election and held elections by the legislature. The original thirteen states used a variety of ways to elect the governor, such as electing the governor by joint ballot with both houses voting on the candidates. South Carolina was the last state to use this legislative method and in 1865 changed to direct election. With the legislative appointment system there was still partisan competition for election. This transition is viewable in a comprehensive table (See Tables 2 and 3).

The above information gives a clear understanding of governor selection in the thirteen colonies. For example, the method of selection in Virginia under the 1776 and 1830 constitutions was election by joint ballot of the general assembly. The election of governor was by the general assembly at the first meeting following the election. Direct popular election did not occur until 1851 (Kallenbach 1977: 608-609).

The second objective was to determine the party affiliation of each governor. Party competition first developed in New York when party alignments appeared on the state level in the 1790s (Kallenbach 1977: 15). However, many of the early governors had unreported or conflicting listings of party affiliations. Party affiliation for all unknown governors, from 1789-1824 were compared using several standard reference sources. The standard sources used are: American State Governors, The Dictionary of American Biography, Register of Governors, American Governors and Gubernatorial Elections, and The Guide to US Elections. These sources list the governors by state and party preference. Yet, some of these sources gave conflicting reports. When the primary

sources do not give the adequate material then these secondary sources were used in conjunction with political histories of each state, the biographies of the governors, History Search, and First Search. In some cases beliefs and ideologies of the governors permit inferences about party affiliation. The Great Principle was a deciding issue in the early formation of parties. The Great Principle was a debate centering around possible adoption of a new constitution. This debate will be explored in greater depth later in the analysis. This issue could often help to determine if a governor was a Federalist (supported the constitution) or an Anti-Federalist (against the constitution).

The following is an example of one such search for a governor from New Hampshire. John Sullivan was a New Hampshire governor from 1789-1790. He pushed hard for ratification of the constitution and was a Federalist. He thought the constitution was "one of the best systems of government that was ever devised." Sullivan even went so far as to propose a set of convention regulations that would ensure ratification (Daniell 1970: 217). This governor affiliation is identifiable because of his strong stand on the constitution. Other governors do not have strong party affiliations and are not identified in the primary sources. Further research confirms that many of these governors were basically nonpartisan. For example, the case of Thomas Chittenden from Vermont. Chittenden was not a party leader and attempted to ban party contests. Chittenden is comparable to President Washington, who also did not wish to have strong party ties. Chittenden and Washington were both elder state leaders who considered themselves to be above factional politics and parties (Robinson 1916: 3).

Another key aspect of the research process involved compiling comprehensive tables to list all governors and their party affiliations. Chart 1 is an example of the charts that were produced for each of the twenty three states in the study. It displays all of the standard reference sources and footnotes for any other additional informative sources. The state of Virginia is used in the example. If all of the standard sources agreed then the agreed political affiliation was used. If there was a conflict or missing data then additional research was pursued. After this research a final determination of political affiliation was used. In Virginia the affiliation of four governors was unknown or the standard sources presented conflicting information. The party affiliation for these governors was obtained by consulting primary and secondary sources, such as biographies and state histories. These secondary sources were useful in providing information and party affiliation was confirmed. The following governors were researched: Beverly Randolph, Henry Lee, Robert Brooke, and James Woods. State histories identified the party preferences for these governors. In these cases support for or against the constitution was a factor that helped decide party identification. After this research, it was learned that Randolph and Lee were both Federalists. Brooke and Woods were both Republicans (See Chart 1). This research was done for each of the states until all party preferences were identified.

Once all the party affiliations for the governors were determined a database was composed. The final party affiliations are viewable in a twenty-four by thirty-five table. The rows divide by state regions into four sections (See Table 4). The data is also

observable in a series of color maps illustrating the regional distribution of political party affiliation (See Maps).

The third objective is to explore the regional differences in political party affiliation. The study of each state determines gubernatorial parties (See Table 4). These observances lead to determine if and why one party may dominate a region. Regional party patterns among the four regions were examined to discover similarities and differences among these areas. A map for each individual year and the party preference for each state governor was drawn to aid in this analysis (See Maps). These maps allow a visual representation of the gubernatorial affiliation data and allow geographical comparisons. In addition to mapping of party preferences, party percentage by region was calculated (See Table 5). This provides some comparative statistics on which parties rose and fell between 1794 and 1824.

The Federalist vs. Anti Federalist Period (1788-1790)

"Once the conflict is identified as a contest between enduring principles, one need seek no further for an explanation or the rapid rise of party activity" (Aldrich 1995: 93). The beginning political affiliations concentrated on issues relating to the newly formed government and the constitution. According to Aldrich, the beginning party divisions centered on the debate over the Great Principle. This principle focused on how much power the newly created national government should have in relation to the states. Some of the early founders wanted a strong national government with little emphasis on state rights. Other founders wanted to ensure that the states would have guaranteed rights and protections. This would ensure that the federal government would not take too much

power. The opposing sides began to move toward distinct party divisions on this principle (Aldrich 1995: 72). All important issues became polarized around the factions that emerged over this debate (Aldrich 1995: 81). The debate over the Great Principle, combined with sectional interests, produced a disorganized state of affairs. The affiliations acted to channel these divisions and provide some type of solution to the great principle (Aldrich 1995:93). So, the Federalists and Anti-Federalists evolved out of the Great Principle debate. (Aldrich 1995: 45).

Members of the Federalist party during this time favored adoption of the 1787 constitution. Supporters of the new constitution, in ratifying conventions and before the general public, assumed the name Federalist. The Federalists were often guided by Alexander Hamilton and had interest in the mercantile, shipping, and manufacturing industries. The Federalists assumed the responsibility of implementing the new constitution when the new government came into existence in April 1789 (Knoles 1995: 634). The Federalists also resisted the Bill of Rights and resisted incorporation into the new constitution. But, popular support favored the Bill of Rights and the Federalists eventually conceded. The Federalists did not feel a Bill of Rights was necessary because state rights would be implied under the new constitution. The Federalists did not think these rights needed to be written (Rutland 1995: 155-156).

The Federalists and Anti-Federalists of 1788 to 1790 were not actually parties, but rather ideological affiliations. The main debate centered over ratification of the constitution and the Bill of Rights. Many Anti-Federalists later affiliated with the Republicans, the party that had similar views. The Anti-Federalists were active from

1789 to 1790 and opposed the formation of a strong centralized federal government (Aldrich 1995: 72). They feared the Federalist plans would hurt the American people eventually. The Anti-Federalists saw the large government as a possible impediment to limit individual rights and liberties. They thought the federal judiciary should be separate from the people and would promote arbitrary decisions (Ketcham 1986: 16). The Anti-Federalists wanted to remove some of the powers given to the federal government and to issue stricter checks on the remaining powers. The Anti-Federalists did not necessarily want the United States to become a wealthy and dominant power, but instead, wanted a republic that was free from expansion and greed. The Anti-Federalists hoped to have strong state governments with local councils and committees (Ketcham 1986: 17-18). They thought that corruption would occur when the elected officials and the people lost contact with one another. Also, they believed that the elected officials should represent the same qualities as the average person. The elected officials should be moral and free from excessive ambition (Ketcham 1986: 18-19). The Anti-Federalists were strongly against the following policies proposed by the Federalists: development of a national bank, government assumption of state debts, and reducing public debt (Knoles 1995: 317).

The Anti-Federalists also strongly favored a Bill of Rights which would provide civil rights and restrain government. The Anti-Federalists wanted to ensure that these rights would be formally agreed upon and issued in writing. They would not accept the charge that the rights were implied and did not need to be written. The Anti-Federalists called for a compromise concerning the Bill of Rights. The compromise stated that states

could approve the new constitution with the condition that a Bill of Rights would be added promptly. James Madison was responsible for ensuring that the Bill of Rights was passed through Congress. Some of the key provisions that the Anti-Federalists wanted in the Bill of Rights are: Freedom of press and speech, speedy and public trials, no double jeopardy, no cruel and unusual punishment, no unreasonable search and seizure, no self incrimination, and no excessive bail or fines (Rutland 1995: 155-156). After the adoption of the constitution and Bill of Rights the Anti-Federalists did not last for a long period and later many merged with the Republicans under the leadership of Jefferson and Madison. Based on the research the only state that elected an Anti-Federalist governor in 1789 and 1790 was New York (See Maps 1789-1790).

Republicans and Federalists (1794-1824)

The Anti Federalists were rather short lived and were soon replaced by the Republican party, which had strong leadership. In many respects the Federalists and Republicans continued the debate of the power of the central government. These debates centered on a comprehensive taxation system, a national mint, and national bank. Hamilton was the leader of a group that generally supported the above measures. Another group, led by Madison and Jefferson, opposed these measures. Madison claimed that Congress did not have the power to charter the bank. Based on these types of disagreements, Madison and Jefferson decided to form an opposition party (Aldrich 1995: 79). The opposition party that formed based its growing dissent on the economic and foreign policy plans of Hamilton and by inference the Washington Administration. The Republican party was able to develop based on the opposition to Hamilton and the

congressional faction that Madison had developed (Chambers: The First Party System 53). The Federalist and Republican parties evolved, gained support, organized, and began to form a basic party structure. The two parties continued to debate prevalent issues of the times. With the development of the political parties, ideology became a main factor. Candidates more and more began to run for office as Republicans or Federalists which provided voters with a clear choice. The new parties encourage representation, democracy, and participation (Chambers: The First Party System 56).

The research of patterns of governor party affiliation tends to remain consistent with the national patterns which were occurring beginning in 1794. Both parties had unique stances which provide insight into the rise and decline of the Republicans and Federalists. The Federalist party developed under the leadership of Alexander Hamilton and there were a series of steps that lead to the development of this party. The national party movement transferred from the national level to the states and counties. The most response came from the New England states and New York (Chambers: The First Party System 49). The years 1791-1793 are known as the "no party period" because the Republicans and Federalists had not formed. This "no party affiliation" is illustrated by the blank maps of 1791-1793 (See Maps). After this period the Federalists dominated the office of governor in the New England region. From 1798 to 1806, Federalists governors held four of the five offices in New England. This support was fairly consistent until 1817. A second factor in the rise of the Federalists was the support of President Washington. He maintained great respect and this tended to boost the party even though Washington did not publicly endorse parties.

The Federalist ideology differed greatly from the Republicans. Hamilton largely developed the Federalist policies which included the following: a large national bank, a powerful military force, strong judiciary and executive branch, and little power given directly to the states (Livermore 1962: 262). The Federalists wanted to promote capitalist growth and stability. A strong and efficient national government was the main goal. Federalists developed an insensitivity to small scale agriculture and many believed them to be elitists. The Federalists thought that the purpose of the party was for voters to confirm the work of the party elites (Livermore 1962: 262). The Federalist leaders would adopt policies and expect that the public would support these actions. The Federalists thought elections should test the policies they had already established. The elections would not be a mandate for change within the Federalist party and would mostly confirm the existing policies (Chambers: The First Party System 54). This insensitivity towards the mass population is a reason for the decline of the party. Hamilton was under the impression that governments ruled by gentlemen were optimal and he wanted to provide for the wealthier classes. The party wanted to support the development of business and industry (Chambers: The First Party System 58).

The Republican party epitomized all that the Federalists were not. The Federalists represented everything that the Republicans wanted to change, such as class stratification and domination of the government by a few (Livermore 1962: 262). The Republicans were afraid that the national government would become too dominant and retreat to rule by the aristocracy. This group also strongly supported the goals of the French revolution, while the Federalists had pro-British tendencies (Chambers: The American Party System

76). The Republicans thought that the actions of the Federalist Congresses had moved away from the nation's democratic principals. The Republicans attracted those who had become alienated by the Federalist policies. Also, the Republicans easily attracted some Federalists who supported Federalist domestic policy, but did not support the foreign policy (Chambers: The American Party System 75). The Republicans had a different view towards the role of the voter than the Federalists. The Republicans wanted the voters to shape the party and be fairly represented within government. This party called for mass participation in the political system (Chambers: The First Party System 54).

Party Hostility and Crises: 1794-1800. Two parties emerged and strongly battled each other between 1794 and 1800. Eighteen Hundred is a turning point and there are strong reasons to explain the beginning Federalist decline. The precipitous decline of the Federalists occurred after the war of 1812. But, the events between 1794 and 1800 represent this decisive battle and the events climax with the 1800 presidential election. The first main conflict between the two parties was the 1794 Whiskey Rebellion in which farmers from Pennsylvania became angry and took up arms to protest a new tax on distilled liquor. Hamilton ignored the concerns of the farmer and considered whiskey to be a luxury item. The whiskey however was actually a basic commodity for many farmers and used for trading other products. The farmers had the sympathy of the Republicans (Chambers: The First Party System 59). The party affiliation of the governor's office in Pennsylvania reflects the events of this rebellion and the plight of the farmers of Pennsylvania (See Map 1794). In 1794, Pennsylvania elected a Republican governor and continued to elect Republicans through 1824. In 1794, the Federalists were

a majority in all the regions except the south. In the New England area 3 of the 5 governors were Federalists. In the Middle Atlantic region 3 of the 5 governors had Federalist preferences (See Table 5). The Federalists had not begun to lose popular support. The main reason for the continued popularity relates to the charisma and respect which President Washington generated. Washington allowed Hamilton to enact many of his policies under this administration. This helped to set up the rift between Jefferson and Hamilton. Jefferson's cabinet position under Washington became severely threatened by the alliance between Washington and Hamilton (Chambers: The First Party System 59).

The next event in this period is the controversy over the Jay Treaty in 1795. War between France and Great Britain broke out in 1793 and further separated the Republicans and Federalists. The Federalists gave their support to the British and the Republicans supported the French revolution and later this war. Jay went to London to help reduce the tensions caused by the war. Many of the Federalists expressed displeasure with the treaty negotiations and attempted to keep the treaty secret. The treaty went to Congress but the proceedings remained closed. Republicans became angry with the proceedings and launched a campaign condemning the Federalists. Washington eventually signed a revised version of the treaty which greatly angered most Republicans. Republicans felt that Washington abandoned France and no longer wanted to support revolutions seeking democracy. The Republican party gained strength because public disapproval of the revised treaty was widespread (Chambers: The First Party System 59-60). The research conducted on governors was examined to determine if the treaty affected the two parties on the state level. The Republican/Federalist balance remained

the same from 1794 to 1795 in the New England and Middle Atlantic regions. There was a significant change in the southern region. In 1794, 3 of the 4 governors were Federalists. In 1795 only 2 of the 4 governors were Federalists (See Map of 1794). The western region voted the same with 100% of the governors being Republicans (See Table 5). The balance between the two parties was slowly shifting in favor of the Republicans.

A third crisis furthers the continuing conflict between the Republicans and Federalists, the XYZ affair of 1798. The High Federalists in Congress and Hamilton attempted to persuade President Adams to declare war on France. High Federalist was the name given to Hamilton supporters in Congress. Adams opted for an increase in the military which angered the Republicans. American negotiations with the French were going poorly and growing anti-French sentiment was associated with the Republicans during this crisis. This crisis benefited the Federalist Party and hurt the pro-French Republicans (Chambers: The First Party System 61). The crisis was compared to the data for governor affiliation in the different regions. The number of governors affiliated with the Republican party would be expected to decrease due to popular disapproval. Yet, this was not actually the case. The Federalists did gain support in New England, but this was always the primary region for Federalist support. Yet, the Republicans did gain even more support in the south. The governors of the four southern states all went Republican (See Map of 1798). The Republican party was not severely hurt by their pro-French tendencies. A possible explanation could reside with the fact that the Federalist party was already becoming split and divided between the High Federalists (Hamilton's supporters) and the Adams Administration. Perhaps this conflict distracted the voters from fully

becoming angered at Republican causes. Also, the regions divided by party affiliation. The New England region consistently stays Federalist until 1816. The southern region becomes increasingly Republican and by 1799 all governors are Republicans. All the western governors are Republican from 1794 through 1824. The Middle Atlantic region varied greatly. But, by 1801 the majority of the governors are Republicans through 1824 (See Table 5).

Yet another crisis soon emerged which further divided the parties. The Alien and Sedition Acts passed in the summer of 1798. The first part of these laws targeted aliens in the United States and increased the time required to become a U.S. citizen. This act was favorable to the Federalists because many new immigrants affiliated with the Republicans. This section of the act was never fully enforced. The second section of the act further alienated the Republicans and was an attempt by the Federalists to destroy the party. The second portion of the Sedition Acts imposed new criminal penalties for printing, speaking, or writing any words that were deceitful or libelous. Naturally much of this action targeted Republican newspapers which the Federalists initiated (Chambers: The First Party System 61-62). The Federalists hoped this act might weaken and destroy the Republican party. The data however does not indicate this to be the case and the Republican party did not weaken on the state level. Party affiliation stayed the same between 1797 and 1798 with the Republicans retaining their support in all regions. The only difference was a slight loss in the New England region, where the Federalist majority increased. In 1798, 4 of the 5 New England governors were Federalists (See Table 5 and Map of 1798). This new occurrence probably does not relate to the Alien and Sedition

Acts. Much of the new Federalist support in this region came from a former non-partisan state, Vermont (See Map of 1798). An example of why the Alien and Sedition Acts were unsuccessful is the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions. Madison and Jefferson drafted these resolutions and were subsequently passed in the Virginia and Kentucky legislatures. These resolutions stated that the Alien and Sedition acts were unlawful and also declared that the states, not the federal government had the right to make such rules (Chambers: The First Party System 61-62). This was an attempt by the Republicans to reassert some powers. Not surprisingly both the governors from Virginia and Kentucky were Republicans (See Map 1798).

Jeffersonian Era: 1800-1808. The presidential election of 1800 was a clear Republican victory that placed Thomas Jefferson in the White House. This seems to be the turning point for the rise and eventual domination of the Republican party. The presidential election showed clear sectional alignments and was a close victory for the Republicans. Federalists once again dominated New England and the Republicans carried most of the south, with the exception of four electoral votes. The Republicans were able to win the election by taking Pennsylvania and New York. The governor of Pennsylvania in 1800 was a Republican. The governor of New York was a Federalist in 1800, but with the 1801 governor's election the state elected a Republican governor (See Maps 1800-1801). New York continued to elect Republican governors through 1824. The research data indicates that the states had a majority of Republican governors which is consistent with the national trend toward the Republican party (Map of 1800). The New England

region is the only area where the governors remain mainly Federalist. The Southern and Western governors were all Republicans (See Table 5).

There are several key reasons as to why the Federalists lost the election of 1800 which advanced the Federalist decline. The decline did not occur all at once, but by the War of 1812 the Federalist Party had made some damaging mistakes from which they could not recover. The Federalist Party became split during the four crises between 1794 and 1800. The Federalists divided into two groups. Hamilton and the High Federalists split over foreign policy issues with the Adams Administration. The internal strains eventually led to an open party split (Chambers: *The First Party System* 63). The Sedition Acts also produced problems for the Federalists. By 1800 these acts became hated in all regions, except New England. The Republicans were able to use the derogatory acts as campaign leverage. These acts portrayed the Federalists in a negative light (Chambers: *The First Party System* 65).

The states or regions that voted Federalist in 1800 all share a common characteristic, slow population growth (Chambers: *the First Party System* 82). This may explain why the Federalists dominated such areas. The new immigrants or citizens mostly identified with the Republican party and these people located in areas where the population was increasing. The Middle Atlantic region split between the two parties. The influx of immigrants, especially the Irish into these states helped to shift the balance to the Republicans (Chambers: *the First Party System* 83). The Federalists did not support the interests of Southern farmers and the concerns of citizens in the West, so they could not attract votes. These areas also happened to be the ones that grew quicker. The

areas where Federalists did retain support was New England, but the population growth was poor. The most Federalist state in the new nation was Connecticut, which had a slow population growth of only 6% in 1800 (Chambers: The First Party System 83). Other New England states with slow growth rates include: Massachusetts (6%), New Hampshire (4%), and Vermont (7%). The governors of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut were consistently Federalist in 1800 (See Table 5).

Madison (1808-1816) and The War of 1812. The election of 1800 was detrimental to the Federalists and they never fully recovered. The election and several other reasons, including the war of 1812, continued this downfall. The Federalists alienated large segments of the population and opposed several ideas that were popular to the nation. The Federalists opposed the Louisiana Purchase which many considered to be an excellent investment. The Federalists realized that this additional purchase would increase the Republican stronghold. This purchase added large amounts of land in the Western region of the country, which never had Federalist governors (Livermore 1962: 10-11). The Federalists declining support in the Southern, Western, and Middle Atlantic regions for several reasons. The governors of Kentucky and Tennessee were Republican from the time of statehood through 1824 (See Table 5). Kentucky and Tennessee separated from the Federalists because they wanted the rights to navigate the Mississippi river and the Federalists did not approve of this. These two states also had pro-French tendencies and actually formed a French revolutionary legion. The Federalists had always been strictly pro-British (Chambers: The American Party System 84).

Other states also became alienated from the Federalists. Georgia governors were Republican from 1797 through 1824 (See Table 5). The governors differed from the Federalist position and wanted the Federalists to take a stronger stand against the Indians living in that territory. Many Georgians were upset that the Federal government had not taken stronger actions to remove Indians from the paths of settlers and speculators. Ohio entered the union in 1803 and all governors were Republican through 1824 (See Map of 1803). Most Ohio governors remembered that the Federalists had objected to Ohio becoming a state. The reason for the objection was that they did not want more western states (Chambers: *The American Party System* 84). So, the Federalists alienated themselves from the masses to an even greater degree. The Federalists suffered because of their aristocratic and conservative ideology. This ideology continued to separate them from the growing democratic spirit and the Federalists did not want to have to adapt their beliefs to fit with this growing consensus (Chambers: *The American Party System* 87).

The War of 1812 and the Federalist hostility towards the war was a final factor in their decline. The Federalists condemned the war which was ultimately more popular in the South and West. The Federalists were afraid that they would lose shipping and navigation acts after the beginning of the war. The Federalists even went so far as to call the Hartford Convention to determine what future actions could stop the war. The Hartford Convention convened in 1814, a few years after the beginning of the war. The Federalists wanted to agree on formal grievances and remedies that the Federal government could enact. Yet, their actions were conceived by many as treasonous and hinting of a possible succession (Livermore 1962: 12-13). When the war ended the

Republicans used the victory against the Federalists and accused them of being Anti-American and unpatriotic. The Republicans described the war as an act of nobility and honor. This message was immediately picked up by the American people who wanted to believe that the war had been just. The only reply the Federalists could issue was lame and accused Madison of trying to use the war to gain election (Livermore 1962: 14-17). Hopes for a national party by the Federalists had disappeared by the end of the war. The only remaining support was in some of the New England states, Delaware, and Maryland (Livermore 1962: 264).

The War of 1812 does appear to be the main reason for Federalist decline and is consistent with the data from the research. In 1812, the Federalists appear to have made some gains from 1811 (See Map 1811-1812 for New England and Middle Atlantic states). This is explainable because the Federalists used the war to their advantage for a short time. At first the Federalists used the war and played on the fears of those who were against the war. But, these threats were too severe and soon appeared treasonous to many (Livermore 1962: 264). In 1811, 2 of the 5 New England governors were Republicans. Republican governors carried the rest of the regions: Southern, Middle Atlantic, and Western. In 1812, the Republicans had declined in New England. A minority of governors in this region were Republicans. In the Middle Atlantic region, the Republicans had lost one of the governorships to the Federalists. Four of the five governors were now Republicans in 1812 (See Table 5). These changes are explainable because the Federalists used the war to gain support at first. Also, the war was inherently less popular in the New England area. Yet, the growing Federalist support did not last

long. Throughout the rest of the war years (1813-1815), all New England governors were Federalists. During this time, the Southern and Western regions remained completely Republican (See Maps 1813-1815). The two parties continued to battle for dominance in the Middle Atlantic region. Yet, the Republicans also held a majority in this region.

The War of 1812 was significant in the Federalist downfall, but there are other important factors. The Federalists also suffered because of their party structure. This was one of the first political parties and organization was poor. The Republican party was wise enough to realize that they could incorporate some Federalist policies as their own. The main reason the Federalists survived for such a long period was because the name was closely linked to Federalism. Federalism was the key concept that the new nation built upon and this gave the party additional leverage (Livermore 1962: 262). The Republicans attempted to adopt many of the Federalist principles. So, the Federalists had only specific policies. The Federalists were then labeled and the constant Republican attacks further hurt the party (Livermore 1962: 264).

The Era of Good Feeling:1816-1824. The Federalist Party decline brought about the Era of Good Feeling, which occurred during the Monroe presidency and was basically a period of no political party opposition. During Monroe's first administration he attempted to subdue all the opposition groups (Mowry: 1995 470). During his presidency Monroe wanted to eliminate party competition because he thought it was harmful to the government. This era began after Monroe made a trip to New England after the war of 1812. He traveled to New England to encourage better relations between the states and federal government (Ammon 1994: 380). During Monroe's second term, his rivals began

to attack his administration in an effort to boost their own careers (Ammon 1994: 382). The Federalists hoped a member of their party could regain the office after Monroe. But, in the 1820 elections Federalist support had declined so much that the party could not run a viable candidate. The party carried only three states. By 1824, the party had virtually disappeared mainly because of little support of masses (Banner 1994: 81). This information is consistent with the research data and demonstrated that the Federalists eventually lost gubernatorial support even in the New England states. This support gradually declined and by 1824 all New England governors were Republicans (See Map of 1824). From 1820-1823, only one of the six Governors from this region were Federalists. In the Middle Atlantic region all governors were Republicans beginning in 1823. But, the Republicans held a majority since 1802. In the southern region, the governors were consistently Republican beginning in 1800.

In the Western region, the governors were always Republicans (See Table 5 and Map of 1824). The Western states included a diverse area (See Table 1 for region listings). The Western states entered the union at various times and all the governors experienced a Republican preference. Kentucky was the first state to enter in 1794 and led the way for Republican governors. The Western states entered the union in the following order: Kentucky, Tennessee (1796), Ohio (1802), Louisiana (1812), Indiana (1816), Mississippi (1817), Illinois (1818), Alabama (1819), and Missouri (1820). The clear Republican margin clearly tilted the balance for this party and led to the eventual domination of the party, not only in governorships, but also in Congress and Presidential elections.

The Republican Split of 1824. The decline of the Federalists was fully evident by 1824. The Federalists were no longer a viable party. The two parties were initially divided by regions and there were distinct regional patterns. The Federalists dominated New England and sections of the Middle Atlantic Region. The Republicans always held the West and most of the Southern regions. As the Federalists deviated from the growing American sentiment the regional patterns begin to shift and the Republican party begin to dominate the map. Eventually the Republicans dominated the political landscape and enforced their policies and expectations.

The first party system did not last long after the Federalists were driven to extinction. The Republicans also began to feel internal disarray. The main reason for the internal conflict may be the lack of party competition to keep the Republicans occupied (Chambers: *The First Party System* 171). The climax came when the Republican party split over several candidates in the 1824 presidential election. The first party system officially ended with the Federalist decline which culminated under the Era of Good Feelings. The second political system probably started with the presidential election of Andrew Jackson in 1828. This system lasted until the decline of the Whigs (Martis 1989: 3).

The formation of the first party system was clearly a divisive time. Party ties and affiliations of governors changed to represent the growing needs and concerns of an increasing democratic nation. The constitutional debate began the first political factions, which developed into the Federalists and Anti-Federalists. The Anti-Federalists had declined after the adoption of the constitution and Bill of Rights. The Republican party

voiced some of the Anti-Federalist concerns and developed under the leadership of Jefferson and Madison. By 1794 or 1795 the first political party system in the United States has developed. This first system is the "Experimental System" and helped evolve the current party system in the United States (Chambers: The First Party System 3).

Bibliography

Aldrich, John. Why Parties?- The Origin and Transformation of Party Politics in America. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Ammon, Harry. "The Era of Good Feelings." Encyclopedia Americana. 1994 ed.

Andrews, Matthew Page. History of Maryland. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1929.

Banks, Ronald. Maine Becomes a State. Middleton Connecticut: Washington University Press, 1970.

Banner. "Federalists." Encyclopedia Americana. 1994 ed.

Boyd, Julian. "Thomas Jefferson." Collier Encyclopedia. 1995 ed.

Broussard, James. The Southern Federalists, 1800-1816. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.

Bell, Rudolph. Party and Factions in American Politics: The House of Representatives, 1779-1801. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973.

Chambers, William, and Walter Burnham. The American Party Systems: Stages of Political Development. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

---. The First Party System: Federalists and Republicans. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972.

Charles, Joseph. The Origins of the American Party System. Williamsburg, Va, Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1956.

Clubb Jerome, William Flanigan, and Nancy Zinggle. Partisan Realignment: Votes, Parties, Government in American History. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1980.

Congressional Quarterly's Guide to U.S. Elections. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1994.

Cunningham, Noble. The Jeffersonian Republicans: The Formation of Party Organization. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957.

Daniell, Jere. Experiment in Republicanism: New Hampshire Politics and the American Revolution, 1741-1794. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Formisano, Edwin. The Transformation of Political Culture: Massachusetts Parties, 1790-1840's. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Glashan, Roy. American Governors and Gubernatorial Elections: 1775-1978. Hartford, Conn.: Meckler Books, 1979.

Goldman, Ralph. "Anti-Federalists." Encyclopedia Americana. 1994 ed.

Hofstadter, Richard. The Idea of a Party System: The Rise of Legitimate Opposition in the United States, 1780-1840. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1969.

Horsman, Reginald. "The War of 1812." The World Book Encyclopedia. 1993 ed.

Hunt, Don. "Jeffersonian Republicans." Collier Encyclopedia. 1995 ed.

Kallenbach, Joseph and Jessamine Kallenback. American State Governors, 1776-1976. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1977.

Ketcham, Ralph. The Anti-Federalist Papers and The Constitutional Convention Debates. New York: Mentor Publishing, 1986.

---. "James Madison." Encyclopedia Americana. 1994 ed.

Knoles, George. "Anti-Federalists." Collier Encyclopedia. 1995 ed.

Lamplugh, George. Politics on the Periphery: Factions and Parties in Georgia, 1783-1806. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986.

Livermore, Shaw. The Twilight of Federalism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Malone, Dumas. "Thomas Jefferson." Encyclopedia Americana. 1994 ed.

Martis, Kenneth. The Historical Atlas of Political Parties in the United States Congress 1789-1989. New York: Macmillan, 1989.

Miller, John C. The Federalist Era, 1789-1801. New York: Harber and Brothers, 1960.

Munroe, John. History of Delaware. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1993.

---. Federalist Delaware: 1775-1815. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954.

Nevins, Allan. American States During and After the Revolution. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924.

Peden, William, ed. Notes on the State of Virginia. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Phillips, Ulrich. Georgia and State Rights. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Plano, Jack. American Political Dictionary. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1982. 165-166.

Polishook, Irwin. Rhode Island and the Union: 1774-1795. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

Renzulli, Marx. Maryland: the Federalist Years. Princeton: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1972.

Risjord, Norman. Chesapeake Politics 1781-1800. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Robinson, William. Jeffersonian Democracy in New England. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916.

Rutland, Robert. "Anti-Federalists." Collier's Encyclopedia. 1995 ed.

Salmon, Emily. The Hornbook of Virginia History. Richmond: The Library of Virginia, 1994.

Silbey, Joel. "The Rise and Fall of American Political Parties-1790-1993." Maisel, Sandy. The Parties Respond. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc., 1994. 3-10.

Sobel, Robert, and John Raimo. Biographical Directory of the Governors of the United States:1789-1978. Hartford: Meckler Books, 1978.

Turner, Lynn. The Ninth State: New Hampshire's Formative Years. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1983.

Wallace, David. South Carolina: A Short History. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1961.

Region Areas

Table 1

New England

Connecticut

Massachusetts

New Hampshire

Rhode Island

Vermont

Middle Atlantic

Delaware

Maryland

New Jersey

New York

Pennsylvania

Southern

Georgia

North Carolina

South Carolina

Virginia

West

Alabama

Tennessee

Kentucky

Louisiana

Mississippi

Illinois

Ohio

Indiana

Missouri

Table 2**Beginning of Popular Elections-Governors**

Connecticut	1662
Rhode Island	1663
Vermont	1777
New York	1777
Massachusetts	1780
New Hampshire	1784
Pennsylvania	1790
Delaware	1792
Tennessee	1796
Kentucky	1800
Ohio	1802
Indiana	1816
Mississippi	1817
Illinois	1818
Alabama	1819
Maine	1820
Missouri	1820
Georgia	1825
North Carolina	1836
Maryland	1838
New Jersey	1844
Louisiana	1845
Virginia	1851
South Carolina	1865

Sources: Congressional Quarterly's Guide to U.S. Elections and American State Governors.

Primary Reference Sources

Table 3

Congressional Quarterly's Guide to U.S. Elections. Washington, D.C.: 1994

American Governors and Gubernatorial Elections. Glashan, Roy. 1979

American State Governors, 1776-1976. Kallenbach, Joseph and Jessamine Kallenbach. 1977.

Biographical Directory of Governors of the United States: 1789-1978. Sobel, Robert. 1978.

Table 4

Governor Party Affiliation (1789-1824)

	1789	1790	1791	1792	1793	1794	1795	1796
NEW ENGLAND								
Vermont		NP				NP	NP	NP
New Hampshire	F	F				F	F	F
Massachusetts	F	F				R	R	R
Rhode Island	F	F				R	R	R
Connecticut	F	F				F	F	F
Maine								
MIDDLE ATLANTIC								
New Jersey	F	F				F	F	F
New York	Anti-F	Anti-F				R	R	F
Pennsylvania	StateParty	StateParty				R	R	R
Delaware	F	F				F	F	F
Maryland	F	F				F	F	F
SOUTHERN								
Virginia	F	F				F	R	R
North Carolina	F	F				R	R	R
South Carolina	R	R				F	F	F
Georgia	F	R				F	F	R
WESTERN								
Tennessee								R
Kentucky						R	R	R
Louisiana								
Mississippi								
Illinois								
Ohio								
Indiana								
Alabama								
Missouri								

Governor Party Affiliation (1789-1824)

	1797	1798	1799	1800	1801	1802	1803	1804
NEW ENGLAND								
Vermont	NP	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
New Hampshire	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
Massachusetts	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
Rhode Island	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Connecticut	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
Maine								
MIDDLE ATLANTIC								
New Jersey	F	F	F	F	F	R	R	R
New York	F	F	F	F	R	R	R	R
Pennsylvania	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Delaware	F	F	F	F	F	R	R	R
Maryland	F	F	F	F	F	R	R	R
SOUTHERN								
Virginia	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
North Carolina	R	R	F	R	R	R	R	R
South Carolina	R	R	F	R	R	R	R	R
Georgia	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
WESTERN								
Tennessee	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Kentucky	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Louisiana								
Mississippi								
Illinois								
Ohio							R	R
Indiana								
Alabama								
Missouri								

Governor Party Affiliation (1789-1824)								
	1813	1814	1815	1816	1817	1818	1819	1820
NEW ENGLAND								
Vermont	F	F	F	R	R	R	R	R
New Hampshire	F	F	F	R	R	R	R	R
Massachusetts	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
Rhode Island	F	F	F	F	R	R	R	R
Connecticut	F	F	F	F	R	R	R	R
Maine								R
MIDDLE ATLANTIC								
New Jersey	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
New York	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Pennsylvania	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Delaware	R	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
Maryland	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	R
SOUTHERN								
Virginia	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
North Carolina	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
South Carolina	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Georgia	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
WESTERN								
Tennessee	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Kentucky	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Louisiana	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Mississippi					R	R	R	R
Illinois						R	R	R
Ohio	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Indiana				R	R	R	R	R
Alabama							R	R
Missouri								R

Governor Party Affiliation (1789-1824)								
	1805	1806	1807	1808	1809	1810	1811	1812
NEW ENGLAND								
Vermont	F	F	F	R	R	R	R	R
New Hampshire	F	R	R	R	F	R	R	R
Massachusetts	F	F	R	R	F	R	R	F
Rhode Island	R	F	R	R	R	R	F	F
Connecticut	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
Maine								
MIDDLE ATLANTIC								
New Jersey	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
New York	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Pennsylvania	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Delaware	F	F	F	F	F	F	R	R
Maryland	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	F
SOUTHERN								
Virginia	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
North Carolina	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
South Carolina	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Georgia	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
WESTERN								
Tennessee	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Kentucky	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Louisiana								R
Mississippi								
Illinois								
Ohio	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Indiana								
Alabama								
Missouri								

Governor Party Afiliation (1789-1824)				
	1821	1822	1823	1824
NEW ENGALND				
Vermont	R	R	R	R
New Hampshire	R	R	R	R
Massachusetts	F	F	F	R
Rhode Island	R	R	R	R
Connecticut	R	R	R	R
Maine	R	R	R	R
MIDDLE ATLANTIC				
New Jersey	R	R	R	R
New York	R	R	R	R
Pennsylvannia	R	R	R	R
Delaware	R	F	R	F
Maryland	R	R	R	R
SOUTHERN				
Virginia	R	R	R	R
North Carolina	R	R	R	R
South Carolina	R	R	R	R
Georgia	R	R	R	R
WESTERN				
Tennessee	R	R	R	R
Kentucky	R	R	R	R
Louisiana	R	R	R	R
Mississippi	R	R	R	R
Illinois	R	R	R	R
Ohio	R	R	R	R
Indiana	R	R	R	R
Alabama	R	R	R	R
Missouri	R	R	R	R

Table 5				
Party Affiliation By Region				
	<i>New England</i>	<i>Middle Atlantic</i>	<i>Southern</i>	<i>Western</i>
1794	1NP (20%) 2F (40%) 2R (40%)	3F (60%) 2R (40%)	3F (75%) 1R (25%)	1R (100%)
1795	1NP (20%) 2F (40%) 2R (40%)	3F (60%) 2R (40%)	2F (50%) 2R (50%)	1R (100%)
1796	1NP (20%) 2F (40%) 2R (40%)	4F (75%) 1R (25%)	1F (25%) 3r (75%)	2R (100%)
1797	1NP (20%) 3F (60%) 1R (20%)	4F (75%) 1R (25%)	4R (100%)	2R (100%)
1798	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	4F (75%) 1R (25%)	4R (100%)	2R (100%)
1799	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	4F (75%) 1R (25%)	2F (50%) 2R (50%)	2R (100%)
1800	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	4F (75%) 1R (25%)	4R (100%)	2R (100%)
1801	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	3F (60%) 2R (40%)	4R (100%)	2R (100%)
1802	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	5R (100%)	4R (100%)	2R (100%)
1803	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	5R (100%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1804	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	5R (100%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1805	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1806	4F (80%) 1R (20%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1807	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1808	1F (20%) 4R (80%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1809	3F (60%) 2R (40%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1810	1F (20%) 4R (80%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1811	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	5R (100%)	4R (100%)	3R (100%)
1812	3F (60%) 2R (40%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	4R (100%)
1813	5F (100%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	4R (100%)
1814	5F (100%)	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	4R (100%)	4R (100%)
1815	5F (100%)	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	4R (100%)	4R (100%)
1816	3F (60%) 2R (40%)	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	4R (100%)	5R (100%)
1817	1F (20%) 4R (80%)	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	4R (100%)	6R (100%)
1818	1F (20%) 4R (80%)	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	4R (100%)	7R (100%)
1819	1F (20%) 4R (80%)	2F (40%) 3R (60%)	4R (100%)	8R (100%)
1820	1F (17%) 5R (83%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	9R (100%)
1821	1F (17%) 5R (83%)	5R (100%)	4R (100%)	9R (100%)
1822	1F (17%) 5R (83%)	1F (25%) 4R (75%)	4R (100%)	9R (100%)
1823	1F (17%) 5R (83%)	5R (100%)	4R (100%)	9R (100%)
1824	6R (100%)	5R (100%)	4R (100%)	9R (100%)